

**Jack Scott, Chair**  
**Bob Margett**  
**John Vasconcellos**

**May 5, 2003**  
**1:30 a.m. – Room 113**

	<u>Page</u>
<b><u>I. K-12 Education (6110)</u></b>	
<b>A. Prop 98 Update</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>B. Special Education</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1. Overall Funding</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Federal Funding Offset</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Maintenance of Effort</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4. Mental Health Related Services – AB 3632</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>5. LCI/NPS Study</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>C. Education Mandates</b>	<b>11</b>
<b><u><del>II. Governor's Scholar Program (0954)</del></u></b>	
<b><u>II. Office for the Secretary of Education (0558)</u></b>	<b>13</b>
<b><u>III. Higher Education Consent Items – Vote Only</u></b>	<b>16</b>

## **I. K-12 Education (6110)**

### **A. Prop 98 Update**

- *Presentation by LAO: Status of Proposition 98—Current and Budget Years.*

### **B. Special Education**

#### **Background:**

There are approximately 663,000 children and youth with disabilities receiving special education services in California schools. Special education students ages 5 to 18 years represent approximately 10.0 percent of our state's K-12 student population statewide.

The overwhelming majority (92.8 percent) of children and youth receiving special education services in our state are 5 to 18 years old. However, 5.9 percent are under age 5 years and another 1.4 percent of students are age 19-22.

**Special Education Students Enrolled, By Age, 2001-02**

<b>Age</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Under 5 Years	38,875	5.9
5 to 18 Years	615,166	92.8
19-22 Years	9,179	1.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>663,220</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: California Department of Education.

The population of children and youth with disabilities receiving special education services in California is very diverse racially and ethnically. Most students with disabilities in California -- 61.2 percent -- are students of color.

**Special Education Students Enrolled, By Race/Ethnicity, 2001-02**

<b>Students Enrolled</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>African – American</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Filipino</b>	<b>Pacific-Islander</b>	<b>Native-American</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Number</b>	281,263	81,444	26,340	7,994	2,913	5,764	257,502	663,220
<b>Percent</b>	42.4%	12.3%	4.0%	1.2%	.4%	.9%	38.8 %	100%

Source: California Department of Education.

Federal law defines 13 categories of disability. More than two-thirds of the students with disabilities in California fall in two categories – specific learning disability and speech or language impairment. (See Appendix A – Page 29)

**Budget Items/Issues:**

**1. Overall Funding.** The Governor's Budget proposes **\$2.66 billion** in General Fund support (Proposition 98) for special education in 2003-04. This reflects a decrease of \$52.1 million or 1.9 percent from the \$2.71 billion contained in the 2002-03 budget, as revised by SB 18X. (This does not count the \$214 million shift of June special education payments as a part of the "P-2 shift" contained in SB 18X.)

The Governor's Budget includes **\$914.9 million** in federal special education funds in the budget year, which reflects an increase of **\$115.6 million** in 2003-04. These funds are authorized under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA).

**The latest estimates from the U.S. Department of Education indicate California will receive a total of \$151.5 million in additional federal IDEA funds in 2003-04 -- \$35.9 million above the Governor's projections.** These additional dollars will increase IDEA, Part B funding to a total of **\$972.7 million** in 2003-04. The Administration is likely to incorporate these new federal funds into their budget estimates at May Revision.

**2. Federal Funding Offset .** The Governor has proposed to use all of the \$115 million in new IDEA funds to offset or deduct any state general fund costs for special education in the budget year. In that way, the state can back out any state funds it provides for special education growth, COLA, and special education deficiencies.

The deduct has been authorized in law since the early 1980's and was continued by AB 602 -- the state's special education reform measure enacted in 1997. However, the statutory provisions of the deduct were frozen or placed on hold between 1997-98 and 2000-01, so that new IDEA funds could be used to supplement state special education funding and implement funding equalization under AB 602.

IDEA statutes and regulations stipulate that states must ensure federal IDEA funds are used to supplement, not supplant state and local funds. In the early 1990's U.S. Representative George Miller became concerned about whether California's deduct provision was legal and in compliance with Congressional intent regarding federal special education law.

A couple of legal opinions developed in the early 1990's found the deduct provision to meet the legal test as long as the state provided maintenance-of-effort so that state and local funding for special education was not any less that the year before. These decisions also seem to require the state to use offset funds for new purposes, such as growth and

COLA. Nevertheless, the Administration faced some additional scrutiny from USDE when it returned to the offsetting practice in the current year.

*Staff notes that the level of the federal funding offset in 2003-04 may change when the Administration revises its federal funding estimates for special education with the May Revision. It would appear that given limited state funding that can be counted as new funds and given maintenance-of-effort concerns in the budget year, the level of the offset may be reduced from \$115 million currently proposed by the Governor in 2003-04 to \$87.5 million. This action would reduce General Fund savings by \$28.5 million – the amount the state could offset – and would increase available funding for special education in the budget year. (See Budget Year MOE issue below.)*

### **3. Maintenance of Effort Adjustments**

The IDEA and regulations contain maintenance-of-effort (MOE) requirements for states in order to qualify for federal funding. Under these MOE provisions, California must provide annual assurances that state funding – defined as state General Funds and property taxes expended for special education – does not decrease from year-to-year. Failure to comply results in penalties in the form of reduced federal funding in the amount of the state shortfall.

**The LAO has identified two MOE issues that could threaten federal funding for our state. One problem originates in the current year and one originates in the budget year:**

***Current Year MOE Concern:*** The current year problem results from the shift of \$214 million in special education apportionment payments from June 2003 to July 2003. This action was a part of the “P-2 Shift” enacted by SB 18X in order to make mid-year reductions to K-12 education.

This shift reduces state General Funds by \$214 million in 2002-03 and thereby creates a \$214 million MOE problem in 2003-03. If unresolved, the loss of funding recorded in the current year could result in a loss of federal funding of a similar amount in the budget year.

The LAO suggests two options in response:

(1) Ignore the MOE requirement since it is a technical violation of MOE, and if problems arise with the federal government, seek a waiver; or

(2) Appropriate \$214 million in additional state General Funds in the budget year to demonstrate that the shift is a technical, “one-time” action and not ongoing as intended by the P-2 shift.

***Budget Year MOE Concern:***

The LAO has also identified a \$49.5 million special education MOE issued in 2003-04. Overall, state General Funds proposed in the budget year fall \$28.5 million short of meeting federal MOE requirements. In addition, another \$21 million in General Funds included in the Governor’s Budget for another purpose in 2003-04 would need to be retained, even though they are not needed for their original purpose.

As background, this \$21 million was intended to restore funding from the Governor’s across-the-board reductions proposed for 2002-03. Since the Legislature rejected the across-the-board reduction, these funds are not needed as a backfill, but now appear needed to avoid a General Fund MOE problem in the budget year.

The LAO suggests two options for addressing the budget year MOE concerns:

(1) The Legislature could ignore the MOE requirement thereby saving \$57 million in General Funds by increasing the federal funds offset by \$35.9 million and reducing the \$21 million in unspecified funds in the Governor’s Budget, which would no longer be needed. Without a waiver this would be a violation of federal MOE requirements and could result in a loss of \$49.5 million in 2004-05.

*Staff notes that based upon the LAO’s recommendation, the California Department of Education recently made informal inquiries to the U.S. Department of Education about obtaining such a waiver of our state’s MOE requirement in the budget year. While a formal request has not been made, early signals are that such a waiver has never been granted to a state and would not likely be granted to our state at this time.*

(2) Alternatively, the Legislature could fully satisfy the MOE requirement, which would make \$85.5 million in funds available for special education including \$49.5 million from the General Fund and \$35.9 million in new federal funds. Of the \$49.5 million, \$21 million is already included in the Governor’s Budget, but has not been specified for any particular purpose.

**Under this scenario, the LAO recommends a few spending options for the \$85.5 million in funds that may be available in 2003-04:**

*Option 1. Provide a 1.55 percent COLA for special education, which would make special education the only categorical program receiving cost-of-living increases in the budget year.*

*Option 2. Implement the recommendations of the LCI/NPS study recently released by AIR to address funding and accountability issues for students who reside in group homes and attend non-public schools. (See item below.)*

*Option 3. Use funds to address funding shortages for mental health services --pursuant to AB 3632 -- for students with disabilities. (See item below.)*

#### **4. Mental Health Related Services – AB 3632**

*Note: This item is on the agenda at the request of Senate Budget Subcommittee #3, which heard this issue on March 10, 2003. Specifically Subcommittee #3 requested that Subcommittee #1 investigate the feasibility of funding AB 3632 mental health services with IDEA, Part B, federal grant funds on a prospective basis (i.e., 2003-04 forward).*

**Background -- Mental Health Services to Special Education Pupils:** Federal law (PL 94-142 of 1975) -- the Education for All Handicapped Children Act—and the later Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) mandates states to provide services to children enrolled in special education, including all related services as required to benefit from a free and appropriate education. Related services include mental health services, occupational and physical therapy and residential placement.

**In California, County Mental Health Programs (MHPs) are responsible for providing mental health services to students when required in the pupil's Individualized Education Program (IEP).** This is because AB 3632 (W. Brown), Statutes of 1984, shifted responsibility for providing these services from school districts and transferred them to the counties.

These services are an entitlement and children can receive services irrespective of their parent's income-level. In addition, County MHPs cannot charge families for these services because the children are entitled to a free and appropriate public education -- referred to as FAPE -- under federal law.

**What Mental Health Services Are Mandated?** Mental health services include assessments, and all or a combination of individual therapy, family therapy, group therapy, day treatment, medication monitoring and prescribing, case management, and residential treatment. Services provided -- including initiation of service, duration and

frequency of service -- are identified on the student's IEP and must be provided as indicated. Services can only be discontinued on the recommendation of the County MHP and the approval of the IEP team, or by parental decision.

**History of Funding for AB 3632 (Prior to 2002):** For the past decade or so, counties have paid for the cost of the program through a combination of the following:

- (1) Categorical funding provided by the DMH as appropriated through the state budget process (about \$12 million annually);
- (2) Mandate reimbursement claims as obtained via the State Commission on State Mandates process (referred to as the SB 90 process;
- (3) Realignment funds; and
- (4) Third-party health insurance when applicable, though parents can chose not to access their insurance for this purpose if they so decide (federal law).

**It is estimated that about \$100 million in total funds is expended annually. Based on statistics from 2001-02, there are about 27,000 special education pupils who receive mental health services provided by County MHPs.**

**Budget Act of 2002 and AB 2781:** The Budget Act of 2002 eliminated the \$12 million (General Fund) of categorical funding and directed the counties to obtain these funds through the mandate claims reimbursement process.

As such AB 2781 (Section 38 of the legislation), the omnibus education trailer bill to the Budget Act of 2002, requires the state to reimburse counties for all allowable costs incurred by counties in providing certain services to handicapped and disabled pupils. Reimbursement by the state would be provided either through the annual Budget Act or other statute.

However, the Budget Act also placed a moratorium on all mandate reimbursement claims for local government, including funds provided for these mental health services to special education pupils. As such, no funds are available in the current year for this purpose, other than County Realignment funds.

In addition, counties have not been reimbursed for prior year claims for these services.

Further, the statute provides that counties are not required to provide any share of these costs or to fund the cost of any part of these services with money received from the Local Revenue Fund (i.e., County Realignment Funds) for those reimbursement claims for services delivered in the 2001-02 fiscal year and thereafter to these pupils.

**Governor's Proposed Budget:** The budget proposes to continue the moratorium on all mandate reimbursement claims for local government, including funds provided for mental health services to special education pupils.

At this time, it is unclear when the moratorium may end.

**Summary of Constituency Concerns:** The California Mental Health Directors Association (CMHDA) is extremely concerned that funding for past claims have not been paid and that any future payment is unknown at this time (i.e., there is no statutory timeframe as to when mandate reimbursements will resume).

Since July 1, 2002 counties have not received any funding for mental health services provided as an entitlement to special education pupils. According to the CMHDA, counties must advance about \$8 million per month (about \$100 million annually) of County General Fund support to maintain these services. Further they contend that over \$130 million is owed to counties for these services since the state has not yet paid claims from 2001-02 and some prior years.

Some counties may be able to provide some portion of funding for these services; however, the CMHDA believes this would create a "catch-22" situation whereby if counties use County Realignment funds for this purpose, they may not submit mandate reimbursement claims for their costs. In addition, County Realignment funds are intended to serve their "target" population (low-income and uninsured population of children diagnosed as being Seriously Emotionally Disturbed).

The CMHDA also states that a lack of funding is also causing service slow-downs in some areas and parents and Special Education Local Program Agencies (SELPA) are becoming frustrated.

**Staff Comments:**

*Staff notes that the provision of mental health services to special education pupils (i.e., a related service needed to ensure the success of the child's special education services) would be an appropriate expenditure of federal special education funds since these services are mandated by the IDEA.*

*Staff also notes that if counties stop providing services due to a lack of funding, that under federal law (IDEA and implementing regulations), schools are ultimately required to provide these special education related services.*

*Staff also notes that there may be supplanting requirements that limit the amount of federal funds IDEA funds that could be made available for AB 3632 services. Alternatively, the state could seek a waiver for such purposes.*

*Some federal funds might be able to be used without triggering federal supplanting requirements. For example, the state can utilize a significant portion of federal funds for state level activities, including direct services. These state-level activities do not appear to be subject to the federal supplanting provisions. In the past, California has underutilized the amount of federal funding expended for state-level activities compared to other states.*

*It should also be noted that mental health related services could be funded appropriately with state special education funding, especially given the availability of such additional funds to meet California's special education MOE problem in the budget year.*

***As indicated in the previous section, the LAO has suggested the possibility of using \$85.5 million in additional special education funding that may be available in 2003-04 for AB 3632 services. This includes \$49.5 million General Funds and \$36 million in federal funds.***

***Additional research is needed to fully explore how state and federal special education funds could be utilized to cover the costs of AB 3632 services. In particular, the Subcommittee needs to identify how funding options would interact with the requirements of Proposition 98.***

***The Subcommittee will hear testimony today from a number of witnesses who may be able to clarify education funding options for AB 3632 services. As the Subcommittee pursues these options, staff would like to point out the following issues that signal a strong need for Legislative action to address the lack of AB 3632 funding and services.***

**1. Loss of AB 3632 funding may create a new federal MOE issue in the current year.**

*The loss of approximately \$100 million in 2002-03 represents a corresponding reduction in "state financial support" for special education and related services, as defined by IDEA. This \$100 million MOE problem in the current year could threaten a corresponding loss of federal IDEA funds in the budget year.*

**2. Lack of FAPE may threaten California's entire federal IDEA grant in 2003-04 (\$973 million).** *The provision of a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) to students with disabilities is the cornerstone of the IDEA. Due to the loss of AB 3632 services, one county in California – Tuolumne County – has formally stopped providing mental health*

*related services to students with disabilities as provided by the IEP. With no funding in sight, other counties may soon be following suit. Currently the Tri-County SELPA in Tuolumne County is suing the Tuolumne County Office of Education in Superior Court. A recent decision by the court found in favor of the county, indicating they were not liable for these special education services.*

*Under federal law, local education agencies are ultimately responsible for providing mental health related services to students with disabilities if other agencies do not. Without additional funding for counties or schools, it is very likely that services to students are or will soon be delayed or stopped. Under this scenario, it is unlikely that FAPE is or can be assured. In order to receive federal IDEA grants in July 2003, the California Department of Education must provide written assurances to the U.S. Department of Education that all public agencies in the state that provide special education and related services to children with disabilities will operate their programs in a manner fully consistent with IDEA. Without such assurances, California's full IDEA grant (\$973 million) – due in July 2003 -- could be delayed or withheld.*

## **5. LCI/NPS Study**

The Budget Act of 2000 provided \$1 million for a study to reevaluate state policy and funding for students with disabilities residing in licensed children's institutions (LCI's) who attend non-public schools (NPS's). The contract was awarded to American Institutes for Research (AIR). The final report entitled *Policies, Procedures, and Practices Affecting the Education of Children Residing in Group Homes* was released just two months ago -- in March 2003.

Funding educational services for youth living in LCI's – or group homes as commonly known -- was the most critical area of the study. Under the current model students who reside in group homes and attend non-public schools receive 100 percent state funding. This funding is not available to school districts. This funding arrangement limits options for students in attending school in less restrictive education settings and creates very strong incentives to serving students in non-public schools.

The Governor proposes funding of \$124.6 million in the 2003-04 budget to fully fund the costs of children placed in LCI's who attend non-public schools.

*Staff notes that given the fairly recent release of the LCI/NPS study by AIR and given unresolved questions about the impact of the funding formula on counties and Special Education Local Planning Areas (SELPA's), there is lack of confidence and consensus about proceeding with implementation at this time. It is unlikely that any resolution of*

*these issues is possible in time for the 2003-04 budget. As noted in the AIR study, the population of youth residing in LCI's and attending NPS's is very vulnerable.*

*For this reason, staff notes there is a great deal of urgency for making changes to the LCI/NPS formula – as contemplated by AB 602 -- to allow more flexible funding, assure less restrictive education settings, improve school accountability, and most importantly improve services and outcomes for students with disabilities residing in group homes.*

*For all the reasons cited above, action on LCI/NPS study needs to be assured for the 2004-05 budget. In order to meet this goal, staff recommends the development of Supplemental Report Language directing DOF, LAO and CDE to develop a plan by November 1, 2003, for changing the LCI/NPS funding formula after considering the research and recommendations contained in the LCI/NPS study.*

*In addition, staff recommends that the CDE develop an proposal for consideration by the Subcommittee as a part of the 2003-04 budget for improving state monitoring of NPS's. The proposal should be consistent with the recommendations of the AIR study. Staff suggests a small portion of new federal funds could be considered for such a purpose.*

### **C. Education Mandates**

**Background:** The California Constitution, as amended by Proposition 4 in 1979, requires the state to reimburse local agencies for costs incurred in complying with certain state-mandated education programs.

For K-12 education, this law provides for the reimbursement of costs incurred by school districts and county offices of education for any increased costs incurred after July 1, 1980 as a result of any statute enacted after January 1, 1975, which mandates a new program or a higher level of service for an existing program.

The Commission on State Mandates decides whether a statute creates a state-reimbursable mandate, and if so, estimates the statewide cost of the mandate.

School districts and county offices of education then file reimbursement claims with the State Controller's Office – detailing costs actually incurred. Once audited and approved, the SCO makes payments for these claims from funds appropriated by the State Budget Act, the State Mandates Claims fund, or specific legislation.

In the event the appropriation is insufficient to pay claims in full, claimants will receive prorated payments in proportion to the dollar amount of approved claims for the program.

Balances of prorated payments will be made when supplementary funds are made available.

The Government Code requires the state to pay interest (at the Pooled Money Investment Account rate) when paying overdue mandate claims to local agencies.

School districts and county offices of education can receive reimbursements for approximately 36 different mandates.

**According to the LAO, the amount budgeted for K-12 mandates has been historically under-funded. This under-funding, coupled with recent decisions to defer payments for mandates, brings current state mandate liabilities – past year and ongoing – to approximately \$1 billion.**

**Budget Items/Actions:**

**1. Governor's Proposal:** The Governor's Budget proposes funding of \$110 million for K-12 mandates in 2003-04. The Governor also proposes to defer another \$870 million in funding in 2003-04 to cover prior year mandate expenses, as well as, new mandate costs.

The \$110 million proposed by the Governor would fund most of the 36 mandates local education agencies can receive. (See Attachment A – Page 30) As a result, this proposal provides partial payment (less than half) of the annual, on-going costs of mandates -- estimated to equal approximately \$260 million. (According to the Department of Finance, because very few of these claims are audited, the actual costs are not known.)

The \$870 million deferral for K-12 mandate claims proposed by the Governor in 2003-04 includes three major components. The majority of this amount represents prior year mandate expenses. These components include: \$565.3 million for prior year deficiencies; \$256.7 million for new mandates in the current and budget year; and \$48.6 million for the interest on the unpaid mandates to date.

The 2002-03 Budget Act provided \$125 million for K-12 education mandates and deferred approximately \$600 million in payments. As part of the current year budget reductions contained in SB 18X, the Legislature deferred \$122 million in remaining K-12 mandates in the 2002-03 Budget Act.

**2. LAO Proposal:** The LAO recommends that the Legislature increase funding for K-12 mandates by an additional \$100 million beyond the \$110 million proposed by the

Governor. The LAO's proposal would bring total funding for K-12 mandates to \$210 million in 2003-04.

The LAO proposes to allocate this funding as follows -- \$199 million for K-12 mandates that would be included in the Core Services Block Grant proposed by LAO, and \$10 million outside of the block grant to be used by county offices of education for mandates.

The LAO cites several advantages to a block grant approach to state mandates. First, since schools could redirect mandate savings to other education purposes, they would have an incentive to meet the requirements of the mandates in a more cost-effective manner. Secondly, there would be no incentive to maximize the amount of claims, a process that contributes to the high level of state costs. Third, schools would save money in administrative costs since they would no longer have to track and prepare claims. Lastly, districts would have an interest in evaluating the cost effectiveness of specific mandates and sharing that information with the Legislature for purposes of reassessing certain mandates.

**3. Mandated Cost Control.** K-12 education mandates costs have risen in recent years because state funding to cover the annual costs of these mandates has been under-funded and deferred. Total mandate costs now stand at nearly \$1 billion. The Governor and Legislature have been silent on when these deferrals will be paid back.

The practice of deferring mandates does not reduce costs to the state – the costs remain and accumulate with interest. In this way, mandates are not like state grants where the amount paid out is discretionary on the part of the state. The claims, once audited and approved, must eventually be paid in full by the state. In addition, deferrals do not free local agencies from the need to comply with the mandates. The Legislature could reduce budget-year costs by eliminating or suspending specific mandates.

## **II. Office for the Secretary of Education (0558)**

### **Background:**

The Secretary of Education, a member of the Governor's Cabinet, is responsible for advising the Governor and making recommendations on state education policy and legislation. The Office of the Secretary for Education (OSE) administers several education programs, including the Academic Volunteer and Mentor Service Program and the School-to-Career Program, which is proposed for elimination in 2003-04.

For the current fiscal year, the costs of the OSE are funded through the Governor's Office of Planning and Research pending legislation to establish the Secretary statutorily.

The Governor proposes total funding of \$6.7 million for OSE in 2003-04. Of this amount \$1.7 million is appropriated for state operations to fund 20.0 staff positions and operating expenses and equipment. In addition, the Governor proposes \$5.0 million for the local assistance programs administered by OSE.

### **Budget Issues/Actions:**

The Governor's budget proposes \$2.6 million in reductions to OSE in 2003-04, including:

**1. Local Assistance – Academic Volunteer and Mentor Service Program Reduction (\$65,000).** The Governor recommends \$65,000 in General Fund (Prop 98) savings for local assistance from reducing funds for the Academic Volunteer and Mentor Service Program.

The Academic Mentor Volunteer Service Program was established by SB 1114 (Leonard), Chapter 901, Statutes of 1992; however, it was first funded in 1996.

Under this program, local education agencies compete for grants of up to \$125,000 annually for three years to fund recruit, screen and place volunteer, academic mentors to work with at-risk children at school sites. Mentors provide academic tutoring, as well as guidance, role modeling and companionship to students. The program currently serves approximately 20,000 students statewide.

The 2002-03 Budget Act appropriated \$5.7 million for this program. The Governor proposed a 9 percent across-the-board reduction for this program (\$618,000) as a part of mid-year reduction proposals. The Legislature enacted this cut in SB 18X, which reduced total funding for the program to \$5.082 million in 2002-03.

In 2003-04, the Governor proposes to reduce this program by another 1.3 percent, or \$65,000, which would reduce the total funding to \$5.017 million. While this reduction is tied to across-the-board reductions for selected categorical programs proposed by the Governor in 2003-04, this program is not included in the Governor's proposed Instructional Improvement Block Grant in 2003-04.

**The LAO recommends that the Legislature eliminate funding for the Academic Volunteer Mentor Service Program due to the existence of other state and federal programs that provide similar program services. This would result in savings of \$5.017 million in 2003-04.**

**2. Local Assistance – Elimination of the School-to-Career Program (\$2.0 million).** The Governor proposes \$1,999,000 in General Fund (Prop 98) savings for local assistance from eliminating the School-to-Career Program

With regard to local assistance programs at OSE, the Governor proposes to eliminate the School-to-Career Technology Grant Program, which would result in savings of nearly \$2.0 million. This program was established by AB 1873 (Chapter 793/2000) as a competitive matching grant program to local entities. The program is a collaboration among OSE, CDE, the community colleges, and the Health and Human Services Agency.

The Governor signed AB 1873 with the caveat that funding would continue only if matching funds from the private and non-profit sectors exceed state funds.

**3. State Operations – Position Reductions (\$552,000).** The Governor proposes \$552,000 in General Fund savings from reducing 8.0 positions at OSE. This proposal brings total state operations funding for OSE to \$1.7 million in 2003-04.

As a result of the mid-year reductions contained in SB 18X, the 2002-03 state operations budget for OSE was reduced by \$122,000 (5 percent) to \$2.25 million. In 2003-04, the Administration is proposing to reduce state operations for OSE by an additional \$532,000 (23.6 percent) to reflect a reduction of eight positions.

The specific staff reductions proposed by the Governor for OSE in 2003-04 are summarized below. These proposed cuts would reduce staffing from 28 to 20 positions in 2003-04 -- a 29 percent reduction in staff at OSE:

<u>#</u>	<u>Classification/Function</u>
1.0	Senior Assistant to the Governor <i>Function: Undersecretary for Education</i>
1.0	Assistant to the Governor <i>Function: Senior policy advisor to the Governor</i>
1.0	Senior Project Analyst <i>Function: Coordinating analyst on issues involving higher education</i>
1.0	Administrative Assistant II <i>Function: Communications support</i>
1.0	Senior Intergovernmental Program Analyst <i>Function: K-12 analyst &amp; program manager for School-to-Career program</i>
1.0	Assoc. Intergovernmental Program Analyst <i>Function: Academic Volunteer &amp; Mentor caseload and program oversight</i>
1.0	Asst. Intergovernmental Program Analyst <i>Function: Academic Volunteer &amp; Mentor caseload and program oversight</i>

1.0 Office Technician

*Function: Office reception and clerical support*

#### **IV. Consent Items -- Higher Education**

##### **March 3, 2003 Consent**

##### **Includes: April Capital Outlay Finance Letters**

Staff recommends that the following items be Approved as Budgeted. No issues have been raised with regard to any of these items:

6420-001-0890. Support, California Postsecondary Education Commission. Payable from the Federal Trust Fund. ~~\$338,000~~ \$432,000

6420-101-0890. Local Assistance, California Postsecondary Education Commission. Federal Eisenhower Professional Development Program. ~~\$5,002,000~~ \$8,200,000

6600-001-0814. Support, Hastings College of Law. California State Lottery Education Fund. \$157,000

6600-301-6028 Capital Outlay, Hastings College of Law. Preliminary plans and working drawings for 200 McAllister Street Building seismic, fire and life-safety improvements as well as an upgrades to the HVAC system and various code compliance issues. \$1,875,000.

UC Capital Outlay projects (see following spreadsheet)

CSU Capital Outlay projects (see following spreadsheet)

Community Colleges Capital Outlay projects (see following spreadsheet)

7980-101-0890. Local Assistance, California Student Aid Commission. Payable from the Federal Trust Fund. \$9,481,000



March 3, 2003 – Consent  
 March 3, 2003 – Discussed by Committee  
 April Finance Letters  
**UC Capital Outlay projects**

		<b>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA</b>					<b><u>Funding Request</u></b>	
							<b>(\$ in Thousands)</b>	
		<b>BERKELEY</b>						
		Doe Library Seismic Corrections, Step 4				PW C	16,920	
		<b>DAVIS</b>						
		Robert Mondavi Institute for Wine						
		and Food Science				W	600	
		Seismic Corrections -- Phase 4				PW	574	
		<b>IRVINE</b>						
		Computer Science Unit 3				C	29,089	
		Central Plant Chiller Expansion, Step 5				PW C	18,800	
		Biological Sciences Unit 3				PW	3,592	*
		<i>-Provisional Language allowing Design-Build Construction</i>						**
		<b>LOS ANGELES</b>						
		Kinsey Hall Seismic Correction, Phase 2				C	17,387	
		Electrical Distribution System						
		Expansion, Step 6B				C	6,228	
		Boelter Hall Fire Sprinkler System				PW C	5,081	
		Campus Fire Alarm System Upgrade, Phase 3				WC	2,654	
		Campbell Hall Seismic Correction				PW	534	
		Geology Seismic Correction				PW	978	
		<b>MERCED</b>						
		Site Development and Infrastructure, Phase 3				C	12,799	
		Castle Facilities Improvements				C	3,000	
		<i>-Spring Finance Letter - Renovate additional 5,000 sq. ft.</i>				C	1,167	**
		Logistical Support/Service Facilities				PW	874	
		<b>RIVERSIDE</b>						
		East Campus Infrastructure Improvements				PW C	8,400	

College of Humanities and Social Sciences						
	Instruction and Research Facility			PW C	31,227	
	Psychology Building			PW	2,241	
<b>SAN DIEGO</b>						
	Pharmaceutical Sciences Building			C	24,714	
	Campus Emergency Services Facility			C	3,987	
	Biomedical Library Renovation and Addition			C	14,503	
	West Campus Utilities Improvements			C	3,940	
	Student Academic Services Facility			W	1,172	
	Satellite Utilities Plant, Phase 1			PW	647	
	Applied Physics and Mathematics Renovation			PW	845	
	Mayer Hall Addition and Renovation			PW	3,559	*
<b>SAN FRANCISCO</b>						
	Health Sciences West Improvements, Phase 1			C	12,934	
	Medical Sciences Building					
	Improvements, Phase 2			P	1,400	
<b>SANTA BARBARA</b>						
	Psychology Building Addition and Renewal			C	9,817	
	Snidecor Hall Office Wing Seismic Replacement			C	10,566	
	Biological Sciences Buildings Renovation			PW	1,000	
	Education and Social Sciences Building			PW	4,116	
<b>SANTA CRUZ</b>						
	Seismic Corrections, Phase 2A			WC	3,000	
	Humanities and Social Sciences Facility			WC	25,826	
	Emergency Response Center			WC	6,592	
	Alterations for Engineering, Phase 2			PW	396	
	McHenry Project			P	3,602	
<b>ANR</b>						
	Desert REC Irrigation Water System			PW C	763	
<b>UNIVERSITYWIDE</b>						
	Northern Regional Library Facility, Phase 3			C	16,177	
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>311,701</b>	
<b>2002 General Obligation Bond Funds</b>					<b>307,534</b>	
<b>1998 General Obligation Bond Funds</b>					<b>4,167</b>	
P = Preliminary Plans						
W = Working Drawings						
C = Construction						

*	= Discussed in Committee					
**	= Governor's Spring Finance Letter					

		CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY	
		FY 03/04 Capital Outlay	
		Consent List	
	Item:		Requested
	6610-301-6028 For capital outlay, California State University, payable from the Higher Education Capital		
	Outlay Bond Fund of 2002		
(1)	06.48.315	Systemwide: Minor Capital Outlay Program, Preliminary plans, working drawings and construction	6,194,000
		Subtotal	6,194,000
	6610-302-6028 For capital outlay, California State University, payable from the Higher Education Capital		
	Outlay Bond Fund of 2002		
(1)	06.52.109	Chico: Student Services Center, Working drawings and construction	32,840,000
(2)	06.56.092	Fresno: Science II Replacement Building, Equipment	1,958,000
(3)	06.76.101	Sacramento: Infrastructure Upgrade, Phase 1, Preliminary plans, working drawings and construction	18,691,000
(4)	06.78.092	San Bernardino: Science Buildings Renovation/Addition, Phase II, Preliminary plans, working drawings and construction	21,786,000
(5)	06.80.157	San Diego: Social Sciences/Art Gallery/Parking Structure 8, Preliminary plans, working drawings and construction	25,384,000
(6)	06.86.115	San Jose: Joint Library-Secondary Effect, Preliminary plans, working drawings and construction	19,633,000
(7)	06.90.085	Sonoma: Darwin Hall, Preliminary plans, working drawings and construction	26,012,000
(8)	06.92.064	Stanislaus: Science II (Seismic), Working drawings and construction	45,696,000
**	Finance Letter	Maritime Academy: Land Acquisition for natatorium construction	1,301,000
		Subtotal	193,301,000
**	Finance Letter	Add Item 6610-491 (reappropriation item) to reappropriate two telecommunications and infrastructure projects (San Diego and Monterey Bay)	

**	<i>Finance Letter</i>	<i>Add Item 6610-482 to extend the time period to liquidate construction funds for three projects: (1) Fullerton -- Physical Education Renovation/Addition; (2) San Diego -- Chemistry-Geology/Business Administration/Math Building Renovations; (3) San Francisco -- Hensill Hall Renovation.</i>	
		<b>Total Consent List</b>	<b>199,495,000</b>

	District	College/Center	COMMUNITY COLLEGES Project Name	Ph.	2003-04 Amount	Finance Letter
1	Allan Hancock	Allan Hancock College	Library/Media Tech Center	ce	9,079,000	
2	Allan Hancock	Allan Hancock College	Science Health Occupations Complex	pw	1,109,000	
**	<b>Allan Hancock</b>	<b>Allan Hancock College</b>	<b>Skills Center Replacement Building</b>	<b>pw</b>	<b>386,000</b>	<b>**</b>
3	Barstow	Barstow College	Remodel for Efficiency	pw	266,000	
4	Butte-Glenn	Butte College	Learning Resource Center	ce	17,280,000	
5	Cerritos	Cerritos College	Science and Math Complex - Life Safety	e	432,000	
6	Cerritos	Cerritos College	Seismic Retrofit-Administration	c	2,080,000	
**	<b>Cerritos</b>	<b>Cerritos College</b>	<b>Seismic Retrofit -- Electronics Project</b>	<b>w</b>	<b>58,000</b>	<b>**</b>
7	Chabot-Las Positas	Las Positas College	Multi-Disciplinary Education Building	pw	701,000	
8	Chabot-Las Positas	Las Positas College	PE Gym - Phase I	ce	12,496,000	
9	Chaffey	Chaffey College	Science Building	e	64,000	
10	Coast	Golden West College	Structural Repair Campuswide	pw	199,000	
11	Coast	Orange Coast College	Learning Resource Center	pw	1,024,000	
**	<b>Coast</b>	<b>Golden West College</b>	<b>Structural Repair Campuswide (adjustment)</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>42,000</b>	<b>**</b>
**	<b>Coast</b>	<b>Orange Coast College</b>	<b>Learning Resource Center</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>-265,000</b>	<b>**</b>
12	Compton	Compton College	Performing Arts and Recreation Complex	pw	825,000	
13	Contra Costa	Diablo Valley College	Life Science Remodel for Laboratories	ce	5,041,000	
14	Contra Costa	Los Medanos College	Learning Resource Center	ce	8,176,000	
15	Contra Costa	Los Medanos College	Math, Science, Technology Building	p	716,000	
16	Contra Costa	San Ramon Valley Center	Phase I Building	ce	24,609,000	
**	<b>Contra Costa</b>	<b>Los Medanos College</b>	<b>Math, Science, Technology Building</b>	<b>w</b>	<b>476,000</b>	<b>**</b>
17	Copper Mountain	Copper Mountain College	Multi-use Sports Complex	pw	885,000	
18	Foothill-De Anza	De Anza College	Planetarium Projector	e	1,000,000	
19	Foothill-De Anza	Foothill College	Seismic Replacement-Campus Center	wc	11,438,000	
20	Foothill-De Anza	Foothill College	Seismic Replacement-Locker Rooms	pw	132,000	

	District	College/Center	COMMUNITY COLLEGES Project Name	Ph.	2003-04 Amount	Finance Letter
21	Foothill-De Anza	Foothill College	Seismic Replacement-Maintenance Building	pw	68,000	
22	Foothill-De Anza	Foothill College	Seismic Replacement-Student Services	c	3,606,000	
23	Fremont-Newark	Ohlone College	Child Development Center	e	251,000	
24	Glendale	Glendale College	Allied Health /Aviation Lab	ce	9,196,000	
25	Glendale	Glendale College	New Science Building Equipment	e	735,000	
26	Grossmont-Cuyamaca	Cuyamaca College	Science and Technology Mall	ce	18,349,000	
27	Grossmont-Cuyamaca	Grossmont College	New Science Building	ce	12,141,000	
28	Hartnell	Hartnell College	Library/Learning Resource Center Complex	ce	20,198,000	
29	Kern	Bakersfield College	Applied Science and Technology Modernization	c	4,017,000	
30	Kern	Delano Center College	Lab Building	ce	4,965,000	
31	Kern	Porterville College	Library Expansion	pw	507,000	
32	Kern	Southwest Center	Modernization Phase I	c	2,636,000	
33	Lake Tahoe	Lake Tahoe Community. College	Learning Resource Center	ce	7,133,000	
34	Long Beach	Long Beach City College - PCC	Industrial Technology Center- Manufacturing	pw	698,000	
35	Los Angeles	East Los Angeles College	Fine & Performing Arts Center	pwc e	15,882,000	
36	Los Angeles	Los Angeles Harbor College	Applied Technology Building	pw	613,000	
37	Los Angeles	Los Angeles Mission College	Child Development Center	ce	5,432,000	
38	Los Angeles	Los Angeles Southwest College	Child Development Center	ce	4,482,000	
39	Los Angeles	Los Angeles Trade-Tech College	Child Development Center	ce	3,851,000	
40	Los Angeles	Los Angeles Valley College	Health Sciences Building	ce	14,214,000	
**	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>Los Angeles City College</b>	<b>Learning Resource Center</b>	<b>pw</b>	<b>1,450,000</b>	<b>**</b>
41	Los Rios	American River College	Allied Health Modernization	c	1,724,000	
42	Los Rios	American River College	Learning Resource Center Expansion	ce	9,065,000	

43	Los Rios	Consumnes River College	Instructional and Library Facilities 1	c	6,753,000	
	<b>District</b>	<b>College/Center</b>	<b>COMMUNITY COLLEGES Project Name</b>	<b>Ph.</b>	<b>2003-04 Amount</b>	<b>Finance Letter</b>
44	Los Rios	El Dorado Center	New Instructional and Library Facilities 1	ce	5,896,000	
45	Los Rios	Folsom Lake College	New Instructional Space Phase 1C	c	10,749,000	
46	Los Rios	Sacramento City College	Technology Building Modernization	c	1,562,000	
47	Merced	Los Banos Center	Site Development and Permanent Facilities	pw	1,032,000	
48	Merced	Merced College	Science Building Remodel	pw	1,048,000	
49	Mira Costa	Mira Costa College	Horticulture Project	ce	3,356,000	
**	<b>Mira Costa</b>	<b>Mira Costa College</b>	<b>Creative Arts Building Replacement</b>	<b>pw</b>	<b>793,000</b>	<b>**</b>
50	Mt. San Antonio	Mt. San Antonio College	Remodel Classroom Buildings	pwc e	8,982,000	
51	Mt. San Antonio	Mt. San Antonio College	Science Bldg. Replacement	e	326,000	
52	North Orange County	Cypress College	Library/Learning Resource Center	ce	13,396,000	
53	North Orange County	Fullerton College	Library/Learning Resource Center	e	402,000	
54	Palo Verde	Palo Verde College	Physical Education Complex	pw	806,000	
55	Palo Verde	Palo Verde College	Technology Building Phase 2	ce	7,881,000	
56	Peralta	Vista College	Vista College Permanent Facility	ce	28,533,000	
57	Rancho Santiago	Santa Ana College	PE Seismic Replacement/Expansion	ce	5,524,000	
58	Rancho Santiago	Santiago Canyon College	Science Building	pw	773,000	
**	<b>Rancho Santiago</b>	<b>Santa Ana College</b>	<b>Physical Education Seismic Replace/extension</b>	<b>c</b>	<b>-516,000</b>	<b>**</b>
59	Riverside	Moreno Valley Center	Child Development Center	ce	2,090,000	
60	Riverside	Norco Valley Center	Child Development Center	ce	2,233,000	
61	Riverside	Riverside City College	Martin Luther King High Tech Center	ce	8,711,000	
62	San Bernardino	San Bernardino Valley College	Child Development Center	e	125,000	
63	San Francisco	Chinatown Center	Campus Building	ce	33,180,000	
64	San Francisco	Mission Center	Mission Center Building	ce	28,557,000	
**	<b>San Francisco</b>	<b>Chinatown Center</b>	<b>Chinatown Center-- Campus Building</b>	<b>ce</b>	<b>-33,180,000</b>	<b>**</b>
65	San Jose-Evergreen	San Jose City College	Science Building	ce	12,535,000	

66	San Luis Obispo County	Cuesta College	Theater Arts Bldg.	ce	11,665,000	
	<b>District</b>	<b>College/Center</b>	<b>COMMUNITY COLLEGES Project Name</b>	<b>Ph.</b>	<b>2003-04 Amount</b>	<b>Finance Letter</b>
67	San Luis Obispo County	North County Center	Initial Building - Science Cluster	e	1,650,000	
68	San Luis Obispo County	North County Center	Learning Resource Center	pw	702,000	
69	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara City College	Gymnasium Remodel	ce	3,701,000	
70	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara City College	Physical Science Renovation	pw	159,000	
71	Santa Clarita	College of the Canyons	Classroom/High Tech Center	ce	8,878,000	
72	Santa Monica	Santa Monica College	Liberal Arts Replacement	pwc e	4,458,000	
73	Sequoias	College of the Sequoias	PE & Disabled Program Center	pw	505,000	
74	Sequoias	College of the Sequoias	Science Center	ce	10,586,000	
75	Shasta Tehama Trinity Jt.	Shasta College	Library Addition	ce	6,919,000	
76	Sierra Joint	Sierra College	Construct New Classroom/Labs	pw	1,301,000	
77	Sonoma County	Petaluma Center	Petaluma Center, Phase 2	pw	1,669,000	
78	Sonoma County	Santa Rosa Jr. College	Learning Resource Center	ce	31,935,000	
79	South Orange County	Irvine Valley College	Performing Arts Center	pwc e	14,472,000	
80	Southwestern	Southwestern College	Child Development Center	ce	5,322,000	
81	Southwestern	Southwestern College	Learning Assistance Center	pwc e	2,367,000	
82	State Center	Fresno City College	Applied Technology Modernization	pw	962,000	
83	State Center	Reedley College	Learning Resource Center Addition	ce	5,498,000	
84	State Center	Vocational Training Center	Voc Training Center Modernization / Expansion	p	777,000	

<b>**</b>	<b>State Center</b>	<b>Vocational Training Center</b>	<b>Voc Training Center Modernization / Expansio</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>-777,000</b>	<b>**</b>
85	Ventura County	Moorpark College	Child Development Center	ce	2,901,000	
86	Victor Valley	Victor Valley College	Speech/Drama Studio Addition	pw	591,000	
87	West Hills	West Hills College, Lemoore	Phase 2B Classrooms/Laboratories	ce	9,730,000	
	<b>District</b>	<b>College/Center</b>	<b>COMMUNITY COLLEGES Project Name</b>	<b>Ph.</b>	<b>2003-04 Amount</b>	<b>Finance Letter</b>
88	West Hills	West Hills College, Lemoore	Child Development Center	ce	1,902,000	
89	West Hills	West Hills College, Coalinga	Library Expansion	ce	2,117,000	
90	West Kern	Taft College	Child Development Center	p	221,000	
91	West Valley-Mission	Mission College	Main Building 3rd Floor Reconstruction	ce	4,323,000	
92	West Valley-Mission	West Valley College	Campus Technology Center	pw	791,000	
93	Yosemite	Modesto Junior College	Auditorium Renovation/Expansion	pw	1,026,000	
94	Yuba	Woodland Center	Learning Resources/Technology Center	pw	1,908,000	
95	Yuba	Woodland Center	Science Building	e	714,000	
96	Yuba	Yuba College	Adaptive Physical Therapy	e	44,000	
97	Yuba	Yuba College	Engineering, Math and Science	pw	685,000	
			<b>TOTAL:</b>		<b>\$530,711,000</b>	

**\*\* Department of Finance -- Spring Finance  
Letter**

**\* Discussed in Committee on March 3, 2003**

6870-301-6028 *April Finance Letter*. Technical Changes to Item.

6870-490 *April Finance Letter*. Add Item to reappropriate following projects: (1) San Diego Community College District, District Office, Seismic Retrofit – District Headquarters Building – Construction; (2) San Diego CCD, Centre City Center, Seismic Retrofit – Snyder Administration Building – Construction; (3) Contra Costa CCD, Diablo Valley College – Seismic Retrofit, Technical Education Building – Working Drawings and Construction; (4) San Bernardino CCD, San Bernardino College – Seismic Replacement, Art Building – Construction; (5) San Bernardino CCD, San Bernardino Valley College – Seismic Replacement, Campus Center Building – Construction; (6) Lake Tahoe CCD, Lake Tahoe Community

College – Learning Resource Center – Working Drawings; and (7) San Francisco CCD, Chinatown Center – Chinatown Campus Building – Working Drawings.

6870-497 *April Finance Letter*. Add Item to revert the following projects: (1) \$36,000 for the Cerritos College, Seismic Retrofit; and (2) \$1,045,000 for Victor Valley College Seismic Retrofit.

6870-301-6028 *April Finance Letter*. Revisions to provisional item extending period of encumbrance.

**March 17, 2003**  
**Proposed Consent**

Staff recommends that the following items be Approved as Budgeted.

- 6440-001-0007. Support, University of California Breast Cancer Research  
\$14,759,000
- 6440-001-0046. Support, University of California Institute for Transportation  
Studies \$980,000
- 6440-001-0234. Support, University of California Tobacco Research \$19,434,000
- 6440-001-0308. Support, University of California Earthquake Engineering Research  
\$1,500,000
- 6440-001-0321. Support, University of California Oiled Wildlife Care Network  
\$1,300,000
- 6440-001-0814. Support, University of California California State Lottery Education  
Fund \$22,834,000
- 6440-001-0890. Support, University of California Federal GEAR UP Outreach  
Program \$5,000,000
- 6440-001-0945. Support, University of California California Breast Cancer  
Research \$480,000
- 6440-002-0001. Support University of California Deferral of Expenditures  
(\$55,000,000)
- 6440-003-0001. Support, University of California Lease Purchase Bond Debt  
Service \$115,283,000
- 6440-005-0001. Support, University of California Institutes for Science and  
Innovation \$4,750,000
- 6440-490. Reappropriation, University of California
- 6440-495. Reversion, University of California
- 6610-001-0890. Support, California State University Federal Trust Funds  
\$35,860,000
- 6610-003-0001. Support, California State University Lease-Purchase Bond Debt  
Service \$61,553,000
- 6610-490. Reappropriation, California State University

**April 7, 2003**  
**Proposed Consent**

Staff recommends that the following items be Approved as Budgeted.

6870-001-0574 Facilities planning, Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund of 1998. \$1,116,000

6870-001-0909 Instructional Improvement and Innovation, Special Grant Cash Account of the Fund for Instructional Improvement Program. \$10,000

6870-001-0925 Economic Development, California Business Resources and Assistance Innovation Network Fund. \$10,000

6870-101-0909 Local Assistance, Community College Fund for Instructional Improvement. \$1,242,000

6870-101-0925 Local Assistance Economic Development, California Business Resources and Assistance Innovation Network Fund. \$15,000

6870-103-0001 Local Assistance, Lease-Purchase Payments. \$55,948,000

6870-111-0001 Local Assistance, CalWORKS, AmeriCorps, Foster Parent Training, Vocational Education and Workforce Investment Act. \$0

**April 28, 2003 -- Proposed Consent**

6120-011-0020 Support, California State Library. Payable from the State Law Library Special Account. \$709,000.

6120-011-0890 Support, California State Library. Payable from the Federal Trust Fund. \$5,781,000

6120-011-6000 Support, California State Library. Payable from the California Public Library Construction and Renovation Fund. \$2,530,000.

6120-012-0001 Support, California State Library. Lease-Revenue Bonds. \$2,427,000.

6120-013-0001 Support, California State Library. Sutro Library Special Repairs Project. \$20,000.

6120-151-0493 *April Finance Letter*. Local Assistance, California State Library. Telephonic Newspaper and Reading Services for the Visually Impaired. Payable from the California Teleconnect Fund Administrative Committee Fund. \$40,000.

6120-160-0001 Local Assistance, California State Library. California Newspaper Project. \$240,000.

6120-211-0890 Local Assistance, California State Library. Library Development Services, Payable from the Federal Trust Fund. \$12,518,000.

6360-001-0407 *April Finance Letter*. State Operations, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Carryover of funds for the Teacher Credentialing Service Improvement Project. Payable from the Teacher Credentials Fund. \$91,000.

6360-001-0407 Support, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Payable from the Teacher Credentials Fund. \$16,774,000.

6360-001-0408 Support, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Payable from the Test Development and Administration Account, Teacher Credentials Fund. \$9,744,000.

6360-001-0890 Support, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Payable from the Federal Trust Fund. \$7,000

6360-101-0890 Local Assistance, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Payable from the Federal Trust Fund. \$378,000

6360-495 Reversion, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Revert \$296,658 from Chapter 544, Statutes of 1998 to the Teacher Credentials Fund.

Attachment A**Special Education Enrollment by Disability,  
Statewide Report, 2001-02**

<b>Disability</b>	<b>Students Enrolled</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Specific Learning Disability	347,595	52.4%
Speech or Language Impairment	167,892	25.3%
Mental Retardation	42,255	6.4%
Emotional Disturbance	24,554	3.7%
Other Health Impairment	24,241	3.7%
Autism	17,508	2.6%
Orthopedic Impairment	15,041	2.4%
Hard of Hearing	6,656	1.0%
Multiple Disability	6,619	1.0%
Deaf	4,634	.7%
Visual Impairment	4,578	.7%
Traumatic Brain Injury	1,458	.2%
Deaf-Blindness	189	.03%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>663,220</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: California Department of Education, Special Education Division

Attachment B**State-Mandated Local Programs Funded By Governor in 2003-04**

<b>Mandate</b>	<b>Amount of Funding</b>
Annual Parent Notification	\$4,384.0
Caregiver Affidavits	348.0
Pupil Suspension – district employee reports	1.0
Intra-District Attendance	1.0
Inter-District Attendance	1.0
Inter-District Transfer – Parent's employment	1.0
Mandate Reimbursement process	1.0
Graduation Requirements	12,504.0
Notification Truancy	7,174.0
Pupil Expulsions/Expulsion Appeals	2,183.0
Open Meetings Acts	3,055.0
Pupil Exclusions	349.0
Charter Schools	538.0
Investment Reports	141.0
PERS Death Benefits	694.0
AIDS Prevention Instruction	2,805.0
Collective Bargaining	36,465.0
Pupil Classroom Suspension: counseling	1,614.0
Physical Performance Tests	1,058.0
Pupil Health Screenings	2,890.0
Juvenile Court Notices II	302.0
Removal of Chemicals	1,172.0
Law Enforcement Agency Notifications	1,358.0
Immunization Records	3,099.0
Habitual Truants	1.0
Collective Bargaining Agreement Disclosures	244.0
Expulsion Transcripts	26.0
Pupil Suspensions: Parents Classroom Visits	916.0
Notification to Teachers of Public Expulsion	2,567.0
Scoliosis Screening	2,017.0
Unused Sick Leave Credit	2,871.0
School Accountability Report Cards	1,903.0
Emergency Procedures	12,801.0
American Course Govt. Document	181.0
Pupil Residency Verification and Appeals	197.0
Criminal Background Checks	4,579.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>110,441.0</b>